

**WAUKESHA COUNTY
MINUTES OF THE PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 1:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Ellen Gennrich, Vice-Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Commission

Members Present:	Walter Baade	Gary Goodchild	Walter Kolb
	Pat Haukohl	Betty Willert	Ellen Gennrich

Commission

Members Absent: None

Staff

Members Present: Richard L. Mace, Planning and Zoning Manager
Elfriede Sprague, Clerk III
Mary Finet, Senior Planner

Guests Present:	Julie Burris	Brian Turk	Paul Hinkfuss
	Mark Hertzfeldt	Joe Bukovich	Kurt Andrae

CORRESPONDENCE: None

MEETING APPROVAL: Mrs. Gennrich requested approval for her attendance at the “Wetlands in the Context Stormwater Management Seminar” held by the Metropolitan Builders Association on April 25, 2006, in Waukesha.

Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mrs. Willert, and carried unanimously, for approval of her expenses for attending the seminar.

MINUTES

Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mrs. Haukohl, and carried unanimously, for approval of the May 18, 2006, Minutes.

Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mrs. Haukohl, and carried unanimously, for approval of the June 1, 2006, Minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mrs. Haukohl requested that a discussion regarding a Public Hearing notification process to surrounding land owners of proposed Land Use Amendments be placed on the agenda before the next Land Use Plan amendment process for discussion by the Commission. It was agreed to do so.

Mrs. Gennrich stated she has spoken with Gary Casper, Herpetologist, of Casper Consulting and he is willing to present a workshop entitled “Considering Wildlife Habitat When Land Use Planning”, before the regularly scheduled time at the July 20th, Commission meeting to discuss some of the concerns regarding land use and the protection of some of the rare or endangered species of frogs and snakes. The Commission agreed to the presentation being held at 12:00 p.m., and the regular meeting commencing at 1:00 p.m. Mrs. Gennrich will confirm the date and time with Mr. Casper.

Vice-Chairperson Gennrich asked if anyone from the audience wished to address the Commission? There being no one, she moved to the next item on the agenda.

- **ZT-1623 (Text Amendment) Town of Summit**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He indicated the proposed request includes text amendments to the Town of Summit Zoning Code to repeal and recreate Sections 5.04(E)(1)(h) and 5.04(E)(2)(h) as they relate to the setback regulations for driveways along the side property line, as many new residential homes now have side entry garages. These amendments would allow a reasonable approach to accommodating these designs on smaller lots.

After discussion, Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mr. Baade and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”.

- **ZT-1625 (Ertl Investments II, LLC) Town of Lisbon, Section 4, Rezone from the A-2 Residential District to the Local Business District**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property on the aerial photograph, approximately 400 ft. east of the intersection of Hwy. 164 and C.T.H. “Q” in the Town of Lisbon,

Mr. Mace stated the owner owns the adjoining parcel to the west, which is zoned Local Business District. He is proposing to combine the two parcels and use them together for a new business, thereby requiring it to be rezoned to the same. The owner has received Land Use Plan approval from Waukesha County and the Town during the 2006 Land Use Amendment process, changing the land use category to Commercial. The only part of the commercial proposal that will be on the subject property is the detention pond, access to the development, and a small part of the building. The remainder of the building and site development will be on the parcel that is currently zoned Local Business District.

Mark Hertzfelt, agent for Ertl Investments, presented himself for questions. Mrs. Haukohl asked if the approval was conditioned during the 2006 Land Use Amendment process? Mr. Hertzfelt replied landscaping was a condition. However, at the last Town Plan Commission meeting, it was determined by the neighbors and Town that for child safety reasons, a fence is preferred rather than landscaping. Ertl Investments plans to install a 6-foot privacy fence around the southern boundary of the property and wrap around the east and west ends.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **SVZ-1595 (MLG Real Estate 2002 LLC) Village of Mukwonago, Section 35, Establish zoning for previously unzoned lands as R-3 Residential District and rezone other lands from the C-1 Conservancy District to the R-3 Residential District. Other lands to remain zoned C-1 Conservancy District.**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property on the aerial photograph, in part of the SW ¼ of Section 35, Village of Mukwonago.

Mr. Mace stated the proposal has been in the development stage for several years. The original plat failed to identify a navigable stream. In 2002, the DNR identified a small 800’ section of stream as navigable, placing

the lands within 300' of the stream under County jurisdiction. The petitioner is requesting to rezone those lands to the R-3 Residential District and other portions to the C-1 Conservancy District. Mrs. Gennrich questioned if the Village of Mukwonago had sewer, as the development was very dense? Mr. Goodchild replied the development will have sewer.

Paul Heinkfuss and Paul Bukovic, MLG, presented a large overview of the project site and outlined the 300' jurisdictional area. They explained that when applying the required 75' floodplain setback, several of the proposed lots will have limited building envelopes and will require variances from the Village of Mukwonago. The building pads are 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain (per the County and Town requirements) and out of the floodplain. Mr. Mace added this is conditioned in the Staff Report and must also be added to the face of the Final Plat. Mrs. Willert inquired why the building pads could not be outside of the 75' setback? Mr. Goodchild answered that part of the development has already been built so to relocate the roads and sewers would be very difficult. Approval was given to start construction before the DNR determined the stream to be navigable. It is now an after-the-fact request because the original plat was not under County jurisdiction.

After discussion, Mr. Kolb moved and seconded by Mr. Goodchild for approval, as conditioned, in the Staff Report and Recommendation.

Mrs. Gennrich asked which lots would be required to get variances? Mr. Bukovic replied, "Lots 27, 28 and 90. Lots 27 and 28 are in Phase I and Lot 90 is in Phase III." Mrs. Haukohl asked if Lot 90 is in Phase III, why couldn't the building pad be moved back? He answered the building pads are set by the front and side setback requirements of the Village. Mr. Mace explained the main concern is that the building pad is elevated above the floodplain. The Ordinance does allow a 50 ft. setback if the pad is elevated 3 ft. Mr. Goodchild asked whether a deck would fall into the setback requirements? Mr. Mace replied, "Yes, the house and the deck are treated as one unit"; a variance will be required for a deck.

Mr. Goodchild inquired how this situation happened if the DNR had already done a study? Mr. Bukovic replied the DNR had determined the navigability after the first Plat was submitted. The 100-year floodplain study was subsequently completed 2 years later. When the development was started, they looked at the information available for the site and the County, Town and DNR believed all the requirements were being complied with as no streambed had been identified. It was only after the Village requested a floodplain study to determine if the building pads were in compliance, that it became apparent there was 100-year floodplain. Mrs. Haukohl questioned if all the lots within the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland jurisdiction comply with the R-3 requirements per Condition No.1 of the Staff Recommendation? Mr. Mace replied, "Yes."

After continued discussion the motion carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• SCZ-1614 (Philip and Carol Mainwaring/Anthony and Joann Alioto), Section 1, Town of Vernon Rezone from the RRD-5 Rural Residential Density District 5 and C-1 Conservancy Districts to the R-1 Residential and C-1 Conservancy Districts

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Report and Recommendation" dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property on the aerial photograph in part of the NW ¼ of Section 1, Town of Vernon.

Mr. Mace presented the proposed subdivision plat and stated that Garrett Dr., to the west, will be extended to provide street access to proposed Lots 1-8. Lots 9 and 10 will contain the owners existing homesteads and share a joint access point to Guthrie Drive. It was questioned why Garrett Dr. will not be extended through Lots 9 and 10 and connect to Guthrie Dr? Brian Turk, Town of Vernon Planner, replied there was discussion at the Town Plan Commission meeting regarding this issue and it was determined the site distances at Guthrie Dr. were not adequate. Mr. Mace added extending the road would also take away area from the proposed lots and would place the existing houses closer to the road.

Mrs. Haukohl asked if the petitioners have provided the evidence that the storm water facilities are appropriate for the development, as Mill Creek is a coldwater stream and per the Staff Report the thermal impacts must be addressed? Mr. Mace replied, "Not yet", they are still working on the plans. Mrs. Haukohl felt it should be added as a condition. Ms. Burris, RSV Engineering addressed her concern stating a Preliminary Grading Plan had been prepared which places the cul-de-sac on the top of hill. The downspouts will be connected to black pvc piping directing the runoff to the road. Any natural drainage from the yards entering the creek should not be any different than preconstruction runoff. She added an additional soil boring per lot is scheduled. While the borings are being taken, any pre-planned septic system sites will be identified. Mr. Mace stated that Condition No. 2 of the Staff Report addresses compliance with the County's Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Ordinance. Mrs. Haukohl asked if building envelopes would be identified on the plat? Ms. Burris responded there would be on Lots 5 and 6, as they cannot build into the Environmental Corridor.

After discussion, Mr. Goodchild moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **SCU-357T (KC Kettle Ridge Farms, LLC) Town of Genesee, Sections 27 and 34**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Report and Recommendation" dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W302 S5348 S.T.H. 83, Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and indicated the petitioner is requesting termination of the Conditional Use for a horse boarding and training operation.

Mr. Mace explained this property is in the process of being subdivided into three lots and one outlot by a Certified Survey Map. A condition of approval for the Certified Survey Map was the termination of an existing Conditional Use for the horse boarding operation, which is no longer in operation.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mrs. Willert and carried unanimously for approval, in accordance with the "Staff Report and Recommendation". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **CU-1368A (Rosebury Farm) Town of Genesee, Section 34**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Report and Recommendation" dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W302 S5348 S.T.H. 83, Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and indicated the petitioner is requesting to amend the Conditional Use for a horse boarding and training operation.

Mr. Mace stated the petitioner is proposing construction of a pole barn to replace a barn that will be removed during the widening of S.T.H. 83. They are also asking for an increase in the number of horses allowed to be

kept and boarded on the property and the maximum number of special events permitted from two to four a year. Mrs. Willert asked how many horses are allowed on the property? Mr. Mace answered one horse per acre is permitted. Condition No. 1 states a maximum of 32 horses may be present. Mrs. Haukohl questioned the special events. Mrs. Gennrich explained to qualify as a “special event” there must be more than 100 people in attendance; whether it is a non-profit group or not.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Baade and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **PO-06-GNT-12 (Rosebury Farm) Town of Genesee, Section 34**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W302 S5348 S.T.H. 83, Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and indicated the petitioner is requesting an amendment to the Site Plan/Plan of Operation in conjunction with CU-1368A for the horse boarding and training operation previously discussed.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mrs. Willert and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **CU-1005B (Jerry Roder) Town of Genesee, Section 19**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W330 S4619 C.T.H. “E”, Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and stated the petitioner is requesting to amend a Conditional Use to permit the construction of an addition to an accessory building for commercial truck and equipment parking.

Mr. Mace stated the proposed addition would be used for personal storage and to house the commercial trucks and equipment that are authorized to be parked on the property by the previous Conditional Use Permit. Mrs. Gennrich questioned the intent of Condition No. 4 stating, “There shall be no outside storage on the property, other than personal property and the dump truck,...” Mr. Mace replied the condition was to ensure there be no outside storage of items such as pallets, scaffolding, other materials, etc. Trucks may park outside as long as they are no closer than 50 ft. from any lot line or they can be parked inside the building. The existing buildings and the proposed addition are well screened from adjacent lots. Mrs. Haukohl asked the size of the dog kennel? Mr. Mace replied Staff is requiring an updated Plat of Survey showing the location and size of the kennel and the existing detached building. She felt noise from early morning or late night truck usage should be conditioned, as the noise could be disturbing to neighbors. Mr. Mace stated the hours of operation are conditioned.

After discussion, Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mr. Baade and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request will allow the petitioner a reasonable use of his land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **PO-06-GNT-11 (Jerry Roder).Town of Genesee, Section 19**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W330 S4619 C.T.H. “E”, Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and stated the petitioner is requesting to amend a Site Plan/Plan of Operation in conjunction with CU-1005B for commercial truck and equipment parking to permit the construction of an addition to an accessory building as previously discussed.

After discussion, Mr. Kolb moved, seconded by Mr. Goodchild and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioner a reasonable use of his land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **SCU-1022T (Travis and Carissa Kehl) Town of Oconomowoc, Section 13**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at N79 W34733 Petersen Road, Town of Oconomowoc on the aerial photograph and stated the petitioner is requesting termination of a Conditional Use, which was granted to the previous owner to operate a masonry business from the property. The property was purchased in 2003 and the new owners are proposing to continue their residential use of the property. The masonry business is no longer in operation.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mr. Goodchild for approval, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”.

Mrs. Gennrich noted this area is in the County’s plan for preservation by a non-profit conservation organization. She questioned why there wasn’t a preservation easement on the portion of the property that was natural area, as the adjoining properties were required to have easements? Mr. Mace replied this property is an existing lot of record and therefore an easement is not required. An easement would be required if it were a newly created Certified Survey Map.

After further discussion the motion passed unanimously. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

- **SCU-1022A (Travis and Carissa Kehl) Town of Oconomowoc, Section 13**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at N79 W34733 Petersen Road, Town of Oconomowoc on the aerial photograph and stated the petitioner is requesting Conditional Use approval for earth-altering activities in conjunction with the deepening of an existing pond.

Mr. Mace identified the area on the aerial photograph and stated the pond in question is fairly shallow. He brought up previous aerial photographs identifying it as a pond in 1980, a depression in 1963 and a depression in 1950. The Commission questioned whether deepening the pond would have an adverse effect on the ground water table? Mr. Mace replied the Town Planner has said no, however a permit for the excavation will be required from the DNR. Mrs. Haukohl asked if the disposal site for the spoil is in an environmentally sensitive area? Mr. Mace explained it is in a low area of a field and silt fencing will be required around it.

After discussion, Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mr. Baade and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **SCS-999 (Donald Wilton) Town of Eagle, Section 10**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Memorandum” dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property on the east side of S.T.H. 67, southeast of the intersection of Wilton Road and S.T.H. 67, Town of Eagle on the aerial photograph and stated the petitioner is requesting approval of a lot without direct access to a public road.

Mr. Mace gave the Commission a brief history regarding this land division. He stated that after attending a Town Plan Commission meeting on December 5, 2005 at the Town’s request, he prepared a Development Concept Plan on how Staff would recommend development of these lands. His proposal would have developed the land into a small subdivision plat with a cul-de-sac, providing direct access to the road from all the lots. However, since then the Town has approved the division as a Certified Survey Map, completely contrary to the design he had presented to them. The parcel (Lot 1 of the proposed CSM) in question, is the remnant left between the Certified Survey Map to the north and the Certified Survey Map to the south (No. 8499), leaving it without direct access to a public road except by an easement. Mr. Goodchild questioned why the remnant parcel needs to be a Certified Survey Map and not just remain as it is? Mr. Mace replied because a remnant parcel must be included on a Certified Survey Map, unless the requirement is waived. Mr. Kolb asked if the lots to the north and the south were ready to be built on? Mr. Mace replied, “To the south, yes”, however the lots have not been sold yet nor built upon. They have been created with the intent of future sale. He did not believe the Certified Survey Map to the north had been recorded yet, as there wasn’t a CSM number on the exhibits. Mrs. Haukohl asked if each lot had individual access onto the road? Mr. Mace answered there was a common drive. Mr. Kolb questioned where the road access to the proposed Certified Survey Map would be? Mr. Mace pointed to Exhibit “B” and explained it would be via a 66 ft. access easement that would serve Lots 1, 2, and 3 of the northerly Certified Survey Map and the currently proposed Certified Survey Map (Lot 1). The easement is somewhat like a frontage road, running along the highway and serving as access to the lots. Mr. Kolb said he had spoken with Mr. Wilton who claimed he proposed this configuration (the 14-acre Certified Survey Map) as the State will not allow more than four private drives onto S.T.H. 67. They also indicated there were lines of sight and vision corner issues. The proposed Certified Survey Map cannot be further divided because of State access road limitations. Discussion continued by the Commission, who felt the division was inappropriately planned and poorly designed. Mr. Kolb stated the Certified Survey Maps to the north and the south have already been approved and felt there was no reason to deny the Certified Survey Map.

Mr. Kolb moved for approval as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Memorandum”. Due to lack of a second, the motion failed.

Mr. Goodchild questioned why this remainder parcel was not on the Certified Survey Map to the north? Mr. Mace replied a Certified Survey Map cannot contain more than four lots on a document. The Commission found the exhibits to be unclear as to whether the northerly Certified Survey Map was recorded or not. Ms. Finet clarified the Certified Survey Map to the north had been recorded on May 24, 2006 and that the recorded Certified Survey Map number would be shown. She explained the northerly Certified Survey Map had been approved by the Town. The map was not in County jurisdiction and therefore it did not need our approval. The remnant parcel, which is in County jurisdiction, now exists between the two recorded Certified Survey Maps. Mrs. Gennrich asked if the lot would be buildable with or without the County’s approval? Mr.

Mace replied remnants have to be included on CSM's unless the requirement is waived and they are buildable and have good soils. Mr. Kolb questioned whether the Commission had the legal authority to deny Mr. Wilton's right to build a house on the lot? Mr. Mace responded there is a requirement in a Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance Subdivision Ordinance that requires reasonable lot layouts, etc. Mr. Kolb asked what recourse does the County have concerning this lot? Mr. Mace replied a building permit could be denied, because it does not conform to the Subdivision Control Ordinance. Mr. Kolb voiced his feeling that even though the Commission does not approve of the plan; he felt Mr. Wilton was within his rights to develop his property in this manner.

Mr. Kolb again moved for approval as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". Due to lack of a second, the motion failed.

Mrs. Haukohl stated Condition No. 2 requires a note on the Certified Survey Map indicating the Commission approved this lot without direct access to a public road. She was not in agreement with approving the Certified Survey Map.

After discussion, Mrs. Haukohl moved, seconded by Mrs. Willert to deny the request.

Mr. Goodchild asked what the process would be if the Commission denied Mr. Wilton's request? Mr. Mace responded it could go to the Board of Appeals. The court has recently changed a ruling and the actions of a Plan Commission can now be appealed to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Goodchild questioned if the parcel were to remain as a meets and bounds description, could the owner then apply for a Building Permit? Mr. Mace responded the County would have to approve the Building Permit and because it was created using a CSM as required, it may be deemed an illegal division.. Ms. Finet noted the "entire" parcel is not in the Shoreland and Floodland Protection Ordinance jurisdiction and therefore the County may not be responsible for issuing a Building Permit. Mr. Mace felt even though the Commission did not approve of the division, Mr. Wilton's request did need to be approved. Several Commission members felt that as a committee, they had the right to deny or approve the request, however they were concerned with the consequences of denial. Mr. Mace suggested delaying the decision until Corporation Counsel could be consulted. After a brief discussion the Commission felt it was appropriate to table the request to ask Corporation Counsel "if the Commission has the right to deny the request and what happens when they do?"

Mrs. Haukohl withdrew her motion to deny the request and Mrs. Willert withdrew her second.

After discussion, Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried unanimously, to table the request and refer the matter to Corporation Counsel for a legal opinion.

• **(Bernard Neff) Town of Oconomowoc, Section 18**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Memorandum" dated June 15, 2006, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W390 N7765 Pennsylvania Street, Town of Oconomowoc on the aerial photograph and stated the petitioner is requesting a waiver from Section 2.3 of the Waukesha County Shoreland and Floodland Subdivision Control Ordinance to allow the creation of a parcel by Certified Survey Map and exclude the remnant parcel.

Mr. Mace identified the parcel as Exhibit "A" and stated the petitioner is in the process of creating a Certified Survey Map, removing a small portion of his farm (12 acres), which includes the residence and several buildings and leaving the remaining 101 acres as a remnant parcel. The Town has approved this waiver of a remnant parcel being included on a Certified Survey Map and now County approval is required. If the waiver

is not approved, the petitioner would be required to create a Certified Survey Map of the entire farm. Ms. Gennrich commented the cost of surveying the parcel to create a Certified Survey Map for both parcels would be extremely expensive. Mrs. Haukohl felt the petitioner was intending to sell the 101 acres for further development. She noted it is zoned AP Agriculture Preservation District, and asked if this parcel would be seen at the Commission again? Mr. Mace replied only if there is a Development proposal or Development Plan Amendment and a subsequent rezone. In general, the Commission does not see Subdivision Plats or Certified Survey Maps unless there is some type of waiver. It was felt it was a reasonable request to grant the waiver, as it appeared the petitioner was only trying to preserve his homestead in the wake of further development of his land.

After discussion, Mrs. Willert moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioner a reasonable use of his land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Mr. Goodchild moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb and carried unanimously, to adjourn the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Haukohl
Secretary

PH:es